



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 10/730,948 | 12/10/2003 | Andreas Schaefer | 11884/407001 | 6307 |
| 53000 | 7590 | 07/17/2008 | | |
| KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005 | | | EXAMINER DANNEMAN, PAUL | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3627 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/17/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p> | <p>Application No. 10/730,948</p> | <p>Applicant(s) SCHAEFER ET AL.</p> | |
| | <p>Examiner PAUL DANNEMAN</p> | <p>Art Unit 3627</p> | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☒ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627

Continuation of 11. it does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive.

With regard to the Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) Applicant argues regarding the University's request to extend the functionality of RIB to include a budget increase on payment of an invoice "However the functionality is lacking. Again, clearly a request for development, which is prima facie evidence it was not in public use." Examiner respectfully disagrees the University's request was for expanding the type of transactions that RIB could handle. Claim 1 clearly articulates "responsive to a new transaction that includes a revenue item, executing a RIB rule to determine an increase to expenditure budget generated there from", This clear articulation is prima facie evidence that Applicant's claimed invention is the RIB rule and not the transaction type.

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of Claims 1, 4, 6, 14 and 17 Applicant argues "The Office classified "the art" as "the Accounting Arts," but failed to provide any rational for why someone with ordinary skill in the accounting arts would find it obvious to combine accounting rules with the computerized system and methods found in at least some of the rejected claims." The examiner respectfully disagrees and had to check with Wikipedia.org to determine when computers were first applied in accounting systems, seems that General Electric in 1954 was the first to use a computerized accounting system.

With regards to Claims 1, 6 and 14 Applicant argues "Even if Applicants were to agree that identifying budget variance is the same function as an analysis conducted via a RIB rule (however, Applicants respectfully do not agree), the Office Action does not explain how Prentice allegedly teaches all elements of the claimed invention." The Examiner respectfully disagrees as Budget Variance analysis is well know in the art and therefore does not require an articulation of every step.